REMARKS

Claims 15-17, 19, and 20 have been withdrawn in light of the finality of the restriction requirement. Applicants note that the Office's notation that "claims 14-16 and 18-19 are withdrawn from consideration" is inconsistent with the Office Action that states that claims 15-17, 19, and 20 are withdrawn from consideration and that claims 14 and 18 stand rejected, not withdrawn. The withdrawal of claims 15-17, 19, and 20 is consistent with the Restriction Requirement issued on May 15, 2007.

The Abstract has been amended to comply with the 150 word limit; a replacement Abstract is submitted herewith. Claims 1, 12, and 13 have been amended to recite alternatives, as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 20 has been amended to use a claim format more consistent with U.S. patent practice. No new matter has been added. Upon an indication of the allowability of the product claims, the Applicants will request rejoinder of all method claims containing all the limitations of an allowed claim.

Claims 1-14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly non-enabling for triazolopyrimidines not substituted at the 3-position with phenyl, substituted phenyl, or cyclohexyl. The Applicants disagree and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Action states that the specification only discloses phenyl, substituted phenyl, and cyclohexyl substitutions at the 3-position of the triazolopyrimidine ring. The Applicants direct attention to Table I, page 82, compounds 65 (R^2 is a radical of formula a-1, specifically, indanyl (b-1)); 66 (R^2 is a radical of formula a-1, specifically, b-4); 68 (R^2 is a substituted piperidine, a monocyclic heterocycle); and 148 (R^2 is a radical of formula a-1, specifically, indazolyl (b-6)). As such, substitutions at the 3-position other than phenyl, substituted phenyl, and cyclohexyl, have indeed been disclosed. Further attention is also directed to Table I, compound 13 (page 72), wherein X_1 is $-CH_2-$, rather than a covalent bond.

Detailed reaction schemes and discussion are set forth at pages 25-34 of the specification with representative experimentals at pages 45-71. Tables 1-5 list illustrative compounds made according to the methods described in the specification, including

compounds 13, 65, 66, 68, and 148, discussed above. The Applicants therefore assert that one of skill in the art would be able to prepare and use the full scope of the invention, as presently claimed. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. In light of the present amendments, this rejection is deemed moot.

The foregoing represents a *bona fide* attempt to address all issues raised in the July 11, 2007 Office Action. The Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Date: October 10, 2007

/Stephanie A. Barbosa/
Stephanie A. Barbosa
Registration No. 51,430

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439